

examine them on the merits, even though they include claims to distinct or independent inventions." (Emphasis added)

In the present case, the search for all pending claims together would not be burdensome, since the fields of search would likely overlap and pertinent art to the claims of the identified groups and species would likely be found while searching each of the inventions individually.


Moreover, from the standpoint of costs to the applicant involved in filing, issuance and maintenance fees relating to separate applications if the present requirement were maintained, it is clear that there is substantially more burden on the Applicant by imposing the present requirement than on the Patent Office if the requirement were withdrawn.

In addition, it is noted that to require the claims of the various groups and species to issue in separate patents would result in inconvenience to the public by necessitating reference to more than one patent during searching, in order to review closely related subject matter.

Therefore, withdrawal of the restriction and election of species requirement is warranted.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction and
election of species are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: November 14, 2006 James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

JEL/ejw

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. L8501.03101

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L STREET, NW, Suite 850
P.O. Box 34387
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-4387
Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200